

**REMARKS**

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 1-21 are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 13, 14 and 20 were rejected as being anticipated by Saeki et al. (U.S. 6,320,518); claims 6-7 and 11-12 were rejected as being obvious over Saeki et al.; claim 3 was rejected as being obvious over Saeki et al. in view of Tada et al. (U.S. 6,594,580); claim 10 was rejected as being obvious over Saeki et al. in view of Bullock et al. (U.S. 6,691,028); claims 15-17, and 19 were rejected as being obvious over Saeki et al. in view of Mutsuga et al. (U.S. 5,911,773); and claim 18 was rejected as being obvious over Saeki et al. in view of Mutsuga et al. and Hirota et al. (U.S. 5,568,390). Applicants traverse the rejections as set forth below.

Claim 4 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the allowability of claim 4, but do not rewrite it in independent form at this time due to the allowability of claim 1, as discussed below.

Claim 21 was objected to due to an informality, but would be allowable once the informality is corrected.

By the present Reply, Applicants amend claim 1 to include the feature of the road shape information of the roads being transmitted without corresponding road connection information if results of the decision indicate that the road connection information is to be eliminated. Support for this amendment can be found in Applicants' specification at p. 2, line 17 – p. 3, line 6, for example.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicants' representative on September 6, 2007, during which the amendments to claim 1 were discussed.

Claim 21 is amended herein to change "the" to "that," thereby addressing the objection to this claim and placing claim 21 in form for allowance.

Claims 8 and 15 are amended to place them in dependent form, such that they depend from claim 1.

Applicants submit that the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1 of the present application. In particular, Saeki does not disclose the feature of claim 1 of "transmitting the road shape information of the roads without corresponding road connection information if results of the decision indicate that the road connection information is to be eliminated." The map data transmission method claimed in claim 1 has an advantage over the prior art of eliminating road connection information that can be eliminated from the extracted map data, thereby reducing the time and cost for communicating the map information, while still transmitting the road shape information of the

roads to provide an increased amount of useful information. *See, e.g., p. 25, line 19 – p. 26, line 9.*

The Office Action refers to col. 14, lines 13-65 and col. 23, lines 24- 30 of Saeki with regard to transmitting road shape information of the roads. The cited excerpts, however, only describe that the map data are transmitted based on the priority thereof. The amount of transmittable data is limited by the data amount determining unit 13, based on the priority of the data and the amount of data that can be updated on a display. *See Saeki at col. 14, lines 56-62 and col. 12, lines 24-31.* By contrast, there is no teaching or suggestion of transmitting the road shape information of the roads without corresponding road connection information if results of the decision indicate that the road connection information is to be eliminated. The Office Action acknowledges this point where it states that in Saeki “unselected map sections including both road shape and road connection information are omitted, while selected (remaining) map sections including both road shape and road connection information are transmitted.” *Office Action at p. 11, lines 2-4.*

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Saeki. Moreover, claims 2, 5-8, 9, 11-13, 14 and 20 are patentable over Saeki due to their dependence from claim 1.

Claims 3, 10 and 15-19 are patentable due to their dependence from claim 1 and because the secondary and tertiary references fail to make up for the deficiencies of Saeki.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 029267.56102US).

Respectfully submitted,

September 7, 2007



Jeffrey D. Sanok  
Registration No. 32,169  
Cameron W. Beddard  
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING, LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDS:CWB:crr  
4035339